

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: talljazz@teleport.com (Dan Presley)
Subject: [1911] 30 M
Message-ID: <v01530500ae259cde1c3d@[206.163.122.205]>

30 has been open late here on the west coast-worked ZL2UW at 05:30 UTC with my Sierra, and he was very patient with getting my call & report correct. Seems like a lot of DX guys like us "micro pistols"!
Dan N7CQR

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: "Frank G3YCC" <g3ycc@enterprise.net>
Subject: [1909] 49er power!
Message-ID: <199608010012.AAA03488@mail.enterprise.net>

See my Hints and Tips page for an idea for powering the 49er! Let us all know what you think of the idea.

I'm busy rebuilding my 49er for twenty at the moment.

Bye.

--

Frank G3YCC

Ham Radio QRP Web Page:

<http://homepages.enterprise.net/g3ycc/>

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: "Tim Glennon (KQ4TQ)" <tpga@eci-esyst.com>
Subject: [1900] 49er QRP Power source
Message-ID: <31FF7981.5F92@eci-esyst.com>

49er, QRP Power

Having received my 49er kit from N4ES which he purchased for me at Dayton I wanted to make this the rig of choice for those business trips and vacations. The one problem I sought to surmount was the lack of a easily transportable and replaceable power source. To solve the power source, I took a MAXIM 762 IC and 4 capacitors a diode and a inductor and create 15 volts from two 1.5 volt D cells. This IC is a dc to dc coverter that will create 15 volts dc from 1.5 to 16 volt input source and provide 15 volts output at 150 ma. Just what I needed. Check out the web site <http://www.maxim-ic.com> . The dc to dc converter generates considerable noise so I isolated the power supply from the 49er by a 12 ohm resistor. This worked out fairly

will since the transmitter pulled 100 ma and this gave me 1.2 volt drop across the resistor for 13.8 volts applied to the transceiver. I added the fixes to the output filter on the transmitter side and this resulted in 1 watt of RF drive into 50 ohms. Measurements on the receiver indicated that I was able to listen to 10 uV signals. This provides me a transceiver that operates on 2 D cells and should they fail the local drug store or supper market is a ready supply.

The second problem (a small easily deployed highly efficient antenna) has not yet been solved and will continue to be sought after.

73 s
KQ4TQ

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: k7yha@juno.com (richard h. arland)
Subject: [1907] Aluminum Stock for Antennas
Message-ID: <19960731.213327.4447.0.k7yha@juno.com>

Gang:

Been doing some homework on 6 & 2 mtr beams. Two of Rich Littlefield's articles (Summer 95 & Spring 96) in Communications Quarterly describe a set of 6 & 2 meter beams he built. I like his approach cuz I'm running out of room myself and a set of compact beams for both of these bands would be a great idea.

My problem is the lack of "MR" type square stock and tubing he described in the text. The local metal supplier wants one of my kidneys in exchange for the aluminum to build the antennas. None of the hardware stores in this area carry aluminum square stock or tubing. I am at a loss.

Anyone got any ideas or sources? I know that it's not going to be free, but \$2.50/ft for 5/16 OD .040 wall is a bit out of line with the budget.

72 rich K7YHA

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Scott Rosenfeld NF3I <ham@w3eax.umd.edu>
Subject: [1917] FS: Ten-Tec Argo/Scout modules, 15 & 80 meters
Message-ID: <Pine.3.89.9607312036.A11157-0100000@w3eax.umd.edu>

Argo/Scout 15 and 80 meter modules, in good working condition.

\$29 new, asking \$20 each plus shipping.

* Scott Rosenfeld NF3I Burtonsville, MD FM19mc QRV 80-10/6/2/440 *
*** 6m 75 grids worked on 8 watts *** HF 138 cfmd * QRP-L #147 ***
** QRP ARCI #9054 ** DXCC/WAS/WAC *** 100% dipole powered HF/6m **
* 301-549-1022 h / 301-982-1015 w *** 145.490- 147.225+ PL 156.7 *

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: hbelectronis@BusinessOn.com
Subject: [1908] HB Electronics Catalog
Message-ID: <TCPSMTP.16.7.31.-15.21.16.2174255785.111627@BusinessOn.com>

Pardon the bandwidth.

In the last three days, I have managed to blow away some of my E-Mail.
At least one member of the list asked to be included in the HB
Electronics Catalog mailings. I lost the address of an individual
after I sent him mail telling him I would include him in further
mailings. IF YOUR OUT THERE PLEASE SEND ME MAIL WITH YOUR REQUEST AGAIN.

If you have not reviewed your updated catalog or would like one, let me
know and I will send one to you.

Thanks

Bob Berlyn
N1PWU QRP-L # 161 NE-QRP #226

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Jerry <jfelts@rapidcity.com>
Subject: [1919] logging programs
Message-ID: <199608010226.UAA04863@host1.rapidcity.com>

Is there any place on the internet that I can download a logging program?
Fancey would be nice but not necessary. One that would work off of windows
95 would be super! I've looked but have not found.

Jerry- NR5A

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Roy Boggs <rboggs@pcc-uky.campus.mci.net>
Subject: [1920] Mini T-match tuner questions
Message-ID: <2.2.32.19960801022650.0067420c@pcc-uky.campus.mci.net>

Hi gang,

Want to build a tiny T match tuner a la AD5X,(re: Kb0roL) and need help with the following salvage caps:

A) Plastic AM var caps:	-- --- --- --	Four trimmers unmeshed not shown
	c1 x c2	
common(x) --		C1&C4 or C2&C3 to x= 165pF max
		C4 or C3 to x = 27pF max
	c4 x c3	C1 or C2 to x = 143pF max
	-- --- --- --	C4 & C3 to x = 280 pf max
		C1 & C2 to x = 55pF max

It is two sections, right? What combo makes up the 2 sections? It's as if there are 4 sections instad of 2(?) How do I connect, or what-to-what for the correct capacitance for the typical T-match tuner? What sections need to be switched in for additional capacitance. In the original SLT instructions (QRPP, Mar96), it refers to Osc section as 15-73pF, and Ant section as 17-165. Here I can come up with the 165 pF range but not the osc section separately. I am using Autek RF analyst for measurements.

B) Inductor: Some plans call for 80-2 toroid (SLT), some a 130-6, and others multiple inductors 2 and 6 mix. Also call for 24 ga. wire and 60 turns with 12 taps etc.

Q. Can I use a 68-2 and #26 wire (60 turns) for up to 5 w. (our typical qrp rigs)? If I probably will never use it for 10m or 160m, what tapping scheme would yield finer increments of inductance for 30 & 40m (as in a roller ind)? I also have 50-6 toroids on hand but nothing bigger in 6 mix.

I need help on both areas. Have read plans on many but don't know how much latitude is possible. On the caps, I just don't understand how they percolate. I have built the Norcal SLT, but there I followed step-by-step instructions, and it used air variable caps. This to be housed in a 2x4" plastic first aid kit container. Sorta on the 40-9er theme. Is this lil tuner even worth fooling with?

Thanks in advance if anyone has time to respond direct.

Best 72, Roy Boggs KE4KDT Prestonsburg, KY

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996

From: Jerry Parker <jparker@fix.net>
Subject: [1910] NorCal's August Meeting
Message-ID: <2.2.32.19960731111801.00b443a8@fix.net>

Information on the upcoming NorCal Meeting for August is available off the NorCal Page

<http://www.fix.net/norcal.html>

72,,,Jerry...WA6OWR...K

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Paul Ridley_ <pridley@swcp.com>
Subject: [1922] norcal.org
Message-ID: <01BAF027.4F0F3F20@ppp135.swcp.com>

Hi gang,

Yes, there is a ham group on the norcal.org page. That page is supported by a group of Church of the Nazarene churches and they let us have room for our listing. The ham group is NARF (no relation to BARF)! Its the Nazarene Amateur Radio Fellowship and is comprised of about 400 Nazarene hams and some of our ham missionaries. I've been a part of this group for about as long as I've been into QRP (about 16 years). I do the mailing for our newsletter, The Transmitter. If you would like to see a copy, let me know and I'll send you one.

Paul, KB5DQ

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: John Lockhart <jlockj@minn.net>
Subject: [1911] QRP++ TX Chirp Fix
Message-ID: <01BB7F14.8B99B340@dialup-61.Minn.Net>

Received my upgraded QRP+ back from Index Laboratories today! Had returned it for a transmitter chirp which was especially bad on 10 meters. ("What is he doing on 10 meters with condx like they are?")
The chirp manifest itself after the upgrade was performed on the radio...

Bruce Franklin said that some of the PLL circuits lock-up faster than others, and the fix involved changing the timing a bit to give the PLL more time. The fix works well, with the 20 meter signal sounding very pure now, and just a trace of chirp on 10, which I can live with.

The real interesting news is that QST has a QRP+ that they are going to review in the near future! I'm excited to see the increased coverage QST is giving QRP lately. (please, no comments about anything's better than nothing!) I'm very happy with the QRP+, even with it's minor idiosyncracies and hope the review helps spread the word the radio, as well as QRP in general.

73, John WA0VQR

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Dan Puckett <af045@dayton.wright.edu>
Subject: [1904] Repair shop needed
Message-ID: <9607312050.AA03396@dayton.wright.edu>

Hey gang,

Not exactly QRP, but. My 2 meter box is dead beyond my ability to repair. Now I have to select a repair service. I know the manufacturer can do it, but having looked in the classified ads of QST, I see several that claim to be able. The question of the day is has anybody had any experiece, good or bad, with repair providers? Cost is a big factor in selection, but of course not the biggest. Better to pay a bit more and get a warm fuzzy feeling that the job will be well done.

72,
Dan WD8AAU
af045@dayton.wright.edu

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Doug Hendricks <ki6ds@mail.telis.org>
Subject: [1897] Rig Comparisons & A Proposal
Message-ID: <31FFA6B9.735@telis.org>

I have been reading with a lot of interest the results of the various rig tests that have been performed. QST did an article in the June issue comparing several rigs, and Paul Harden, NA5N has done some tests and posted them to the list.

I am a science teacher by profession, and I have had some problems with both of these tests. First of all, each test only tested one example of each rig to my knowledge. Everyone agrees that how a rig is built will determine a lot towards the characteristics the rig has, i.e. alignment, etc. We need a large sample to get a better picture. Also, the QST article didn't even test a "stock" NorCal 40A, it used one that had been "hot rodded" by the builder, and I quote, "I made a few changes to my NC-40A that I picked up from the NorCal quarterly newsletter, QRPP." I don't think that this was "fair" to the other entries in the tests. In my opinion, the ARRL should have tested a "stock" NorCal as that is what I understand the rest of the rigs to be. If you are going to do a comparison article, which is what it was, then you should try to have all rigs as "stock" as possible.

Now, I know that it takes a huge amount of time to test rigs, but we have a valuable resource right here folks. Many of us have NC40's and NC40A's. Here is my proposal. I would like you to measure the receive current, and the key-down transmitting current, and the voltage of your power supply. Then measure the output power of your rig to the nearest 0.1 Watt. Paul Harden used the method of TX output pwr/ Total TX circuit power to measure the efficiency of the rig. I propose that we use this method, because it is simple and something that we can all measure. So gang, all of you that have a NorCal 40A are invited to submit data for my research. It will be like having a homework assignment due, and will bring back the memories of the glory of yesteryear, when you were a student. Please send the information in the following format.

1. Rig, NC40A Club or NC40A Wilderness
2. Receive Current = XXmA
3. Key Down Transmit Current = XXmA
4. Power Supply Voltage = XX Volts (to nearest 0.1V)
5. Total Power Out = XX Watts (to nearest 0.1W)
6. Calculated Efficiency = XX%
Formula (Total Power Out)/(Transmit Power)x 100 = Efficiency
(Transmit Power = (Key down current - Receive current) x V)

Ok, guys you have the assignment. The due date is Saturday night, midnight. I will compile the results and post them to the net. To save bandwidth, please do not post your results to the net, I will do the summary.

The purpose of this exercise is to gather data and find out how the rigs compare. By the way, using this method, here is what I found out about rigs tested by Paul Harden and the ARRL.

1. Rig: NC40A Wilderness
2. Rx Current: 0.017A (17mA)
3. Key Down Current: .340A (340mA)
4. Voltage: 12.0 Volts
5. Total Power Out: 1.4W
6. Efficiency: 36%

$(.340-0.17) = .323 = \text{Transmit current}$
 $.323 \times 12 = 3.88 \text{ W} = \text{input transmit power}$
 $1.4\text{W}/3.88\text{W} = .36 \times 100 = 36\%$

[Note that I have made you show all of your steps, that way I can check the math. My students hate this but I insist.]

Thank you for your help. 72, Doug, KI6DS

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: "Frank G3YCC" <g3ycc@enterprise.net>
Subject: [1896] Transistor equiv (2)
Message-ID: <199607312008.UAA10345@mail.enterprise.net>

I have put a link to the prog on my web page, hope you can now get hold of it. I presume 370k is too big for me to send to individuals, or is it? Not really sure what the best way to send it is, apart from posting it via snail mail - please advise or let me know if you get it OK!

Bye.

--

Frank G3YCC
Ham Radio QRP Web Page:
<http://homepages.enterprise.net/g3ycc/>

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: "peter (p.c.) abraham" <pabraham@nortel.ca>
Subject: [1905] Where can I get a 40-9er
Message-ID: <"23399 Wed Jul 31 16:31:51 1996"@bnr.ca>

Hello Everybody,

I keep hearing about this "40-9er"

I know it is a 40 meter radio, what else can you say about it?

How does one get this kit, how much is it, and how easy is it to build?

-Peter

Peter C. Abraham KB2INO | Telephone: 214-684-1875
RF Systems Engineer | E-Mail: pabraham@nortel.com
Nortel | Amateur Radio: 443.325+ p1 110.9

<>< NOTE: This file was encoded using
QUOTED-PRINTABLE for safe
transmission. Any binary data and/or lines longer than 132 characters in the
original
attachment was encoded.
Received: from fidoii.CC.Lehigh.edu by bnr.ca id <19960731193614-0@bnr.ca=
>; Wed, 31 Jul 1996 15:36:15 -0400
Received: from Lehigh.EDU ([127.0.0.1]) by fidoii.cc.lehigh.edu with SMTP=
id <174429-59220>; Wed, 31 Jul 1996 15:26:33 -0400
Received: from nss2.CC.Lehigh.EDU ([128.180.1.26]) by fidoii.cc.lehigh.ed=
u with ESMTP id <174378-24405>; Wed, 31 Jul 1996 15:18:23 -0400
Received: from bnlux1.bnl.gov.bnl.gov (bnlux1.bnl.gov [130.199.128.1]) by=
nss2.CC.Lehigh.EDU (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id PAA76902 for <qrp-l@Lehigh=
=2EEDU>; Wed, 31 Jul 1996 15:18:20 -0400
Received: from nickf.rhic.bnl.gov by bnlux1.bnl.gov.bnl.gov (5.65/Ultrix3=
=2E0-C)
id AA23258; Fri, 7 Jun 1996 09:28:02 -0400
Message-Id: <31B82E85.34E5@bnl.gov>
Date: Fri, 07 Jun 1996 09:28:37 -0400
Reply-To: kf2ph@bnl.gov
Sender: owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Precedence: bulk
From
: Nick Franco <kf2ph@bnl.gov>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: Re: need help!
References: <31B693C9.6082@frontiernet.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=3Dus-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-To: kf2zw@frontiernet.net
X-Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.0 (Win95; U)
X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.0 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN
=00=00=00=

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: "peter (p.c.) abraham" <pabraham@nortel.ca>
Subject: [1906] Where can I get a 40-9er
Message-ID: <"23686 Wed Jul 31 16:32:56 1996"@bnr.ca>

Hello Everybody,

I keep hearing about this "40-9er"

I know it is a 40 meter radio, what else can you tell me?

list server at the ARRL. I don't have the specific info in front of me at the moment, but you can probably find it on the arrl web page (www.arrl.org).

FYI ...

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Paul Harden <pharden@aoc.nrao.edu>
Subject: [1901] Re: Lab Tests
Message-ID: <199607311915.NAA04345@zia.aoc.nrao.edu>

Wayne and others,
Regarding my lab tests ...

The QRP-L group is meant to be a forum to exchange ideas and information - which frankly, few subscribers do. I am merely sharing the information I have access to. If you or anyone else has test data on the NorCal 40a, OHR Explorer, etc., then by all means post it. I'm sure the owners of these rigs would welcome another point of view, as would I.

I don't find a 1 KHz IF filter at 5MHz (.02% BW) to be "shocking." On the air, it affords very adequate selectivity. Obviously, 400 Hz is even better. This is the IF bandwidth - overall selectivity is often better on most rigs due to audio filtering as well. Achieving 300-400Hz IF BW with 4 crystals requires matching the crystals with the same center frequency. And to the credit of Wilderness Radio, all NorCal 40a's are shipped with hand-picked crystals for the ladder filter to ensure a tight IF. This is what makes the NorCal 40a such a nice performer. But most builders don't have the means to test and match the crystals. Picking 4 crystals at random and getting a 300Hz bandwidth would be serendipitous. Without hand-picking crystals, bandwidths of 600-900Hz is typical, as shown in the ARRL lab tests (June 1996) and my own.

In terms of transmitter efficiency (not PA efficiency), this is a standard technique used by the FCC and the broadcast industry for years. It does not reflect how good or poor a transmitter was designed or built, but merely to estimate the output power as a function of the DC input power (voltage x current). P_{out}/P_{in} . Very handy for those who don't have an output wattmeter.

The lab tests were intended to COMPLIMENT these rigs, not insult them (there is nothing to insult). However, since it has caused you such controversy over interpreting the "numbers," I will

cease posting any further lab tests to QRP-L. I apologize if you interpreted the lab tests as a personal attack on you or the other designers.

72, Paul NA5N

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Grover <SIXPENCE@worldnet.att.net>
Subject: [1902] Re: Lab Tests
Message-ID: <2.2.16.19960731162940.0bbf107a@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>

Paul: Please continue sending your test results to the list.. They are educational, interesting, useful technically, and helpful in engendering a welcome discourse on useful Ham topics.

Welcome the civil, intelligent responses; as for the others remember the words of old - "Nils Carbarundum Bastardum">(:>)..

72 y Paz ..Grover KQ4AL Occoquan VA
QRP/QSLs WAS = 34 DX= XE VE
QRO/QSLs WAS = 49(-Hawaii) DXCC = 62 IOTA = 27
<SIXPENCE@worldnet.att.net>

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: "Bob Hirsch" <bobh@p3.net>
Subject: [1905] Re: Lab Tests
Message-ID: <199607312036.QAA15461@p3.net>

> Regarding my lab tests ...

>

> The QRP-L group is meant to be a forum to exchange ideas and
> information - which frankly, few subscribers do. I am merely sharing
> the information I have access to. If you or anyone else has test
> data on the NorCal 40a, OHR Explorer, etc., then by all means post it.
> I'm sure the owners of these rigs would welcome another point of
> view, as would I.

> The lab tests were intended to COMPLIMENT these rigs, not insult
> them (there is nothing to insult). However, since it has caused

> you such controversy over interpreting the "numbers," I will
> cease posting any further lab tests to QRP-L. I apologize if you
> interpreted the lab tests as a personal attack on you or the
> other designers.

Paul --

I certainly hope you misunderstood the intent of comments of others regarding your tests and the posting of results to this list. I absolutely would hate to think that all information, and any information, relevant to QRP issues is welcome here on the list.

I am not a designer and certainly I do not even pretend to understand everything that is discussed here on the list or the details of your tests (or anyone else's, for that matter).

But one thing I know for sure is if anyone's findings or observations of any of the equipment discussed here are not welcome as a posting to the list for any reason, then this list stops being useful and is no longer of any value.

Your results were stated technically and not personally. The data simply represented your findings and that is how I took them, as I'm certain others did. I saved them and am looking forward to seeing more. When I get ready to buy one of these products, yours will be one source of information among several that I will take into account.

If you are correct and your posting test results offended anyone, whether or not they were involved with the product, then they can object and criticize constructively, but do not, by any means allow those objections to keep you from posting further results.

Let others post the results and observations they find and you post yours, and let us, as consumers decide for ourselves. That's how the system, and this list, work best.

=====

73 de Bob, AA3ON

No Code, No HF....Know Code, Know HF!

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: wb8ygg@juno.com (Bradley S. Mitchell)
Subject: [1908] Re: Lab Tests

Message-ID: <19960730.173505.10239.1.WB8YGG@juno.com>

Paul es qrp group,

It would certainly be a shame if you decided not to re-produce
test
results for this list. Not everybody has an rf generator that is
sweepable for instance, or a white noise source and a spectrum
analyzer.

I enjoy reading test results, and in particular reading about
different
test methodologies.

Unfortunately because you have shared these results, there is
Critique. Critique is good as long as it is done towards a
positive
end.

In my business, being a test engineer in a large SMD
manufacturing
facility, it is very difficult for designers to believe some of
the test
results that are produced. It's just amazing. But the bottom line
is
that most times, results are based on solid analysis that
sometimes
is simply misinterpreted.

My attitude about test results is absolute knowledge of the
test setup
is required before correlation can occur.

Without totally understanding of the test setup, and
methodology, no common ground will ever be found.

Paul is the first, to produce comparison test results that are
interesting to
me, and give me a basis for comparison. With these we can look at
the
different rigs, and compare the types of circuits used, and continue
experimentation, not necessarily draw conclusions.

regards, Brad, WB8YGG

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: "Robert J. Gobrick" <rgobrick@nfld.com>
Subject: [1913] Re: Lab Tests
Message-ID: <2.2.32.19960731235507.00965260@public.compusult.nf.ca>

Paul and QRP-L Gang,

First off I'd like to thank Paul for venturing forth (with trepidation I'm sure) "publishing" some of his lab tests on the QRP-L here. I have to admit I am a "numbers" fanatic. If anyone remembers the great work that Robert Sherwood of Denver did years ago cataloging all the known rigs on the market for dynamic range, two tone blocking etc you know what I mean - I used to memorize all those numbers and jump back and forth between the different rigs specification sheets to see what the designers did to achieve a blocking dynamic range above 100 (ahh those were the days....). for me it was my "learning" process of becoming a ham and trying to understand receivers.

I believe it was Rob's work that urged the ARRL to try to standardize on a method of testing rigs and thus the famous "dynamic range measurements on 20 meters with a "standard" 500 hz filter with a ARRL Lab standard signal spacing of 20 Khz". Everyone knew if any of those parameters changed the numbers would not necessarily fall out the same. I "trust" the ARRL numbers every time they test a high end multimode HF at those conditions.

Well how times have changed. Sure I've gotten a little older and now take ANY numbers that I see with a grain of salt. Why heck I can tell the difference between some of the fancier multimode HF rigs if they are triple conversion or just dual conversion with a cheap ceramic filter for the second IF (Kenwood TS-50) and the numbers usually bear that out.

ARRL Review:

Now we get to the June 1996 "Shoot Out" of some popular QRP rigs. I applaud the ARRL for publishing a round-up of these great qrp rigs and I applaud them for letting the ham fraternity know that there are some pretty decent qrp rigs out there with some decent receivers. Sure they are typically mono-band single conversion rigs but they are kits and they do work quite well.

Where I feel the ARRL did a dis-service is to treat the evaluation of these rigs like they were a "novelty" and not worthy of some real evaluation. First off I would have preferred to see one "ARRL Staff" person (like Ed Hare KA1CV) build ALL the rigs and properly align those rigs as per the manufacturer - no tricks, no mods etc. At least make sure the rigs are built and aligned to the manufactures specs. All those rigs were built by different folks with possibly different levels of expertise (I don't know this - just an observation). Second they should have at least tried to get

all rigs tested on a common frequency - say 40 meters. Not an apples and orange evaluation like they did - some multiband, some 20 meters, some 40 meters. Remember the ole ARRL Lab 20-500-20 rule (read above). That rule was not adhered to.

Furthermore, it would have been nice to at least have commented on the two-tone dynamic reading and mention that these simple elegantly designed rigs had different levels of rf shaping in the front end, different types of mixing schemes (NE-602 vs rf preamped diode ring mixers) and different levels of filtering 4 pole, 6 pole. variable BWT etc). ALL these things make a difference when you are trying to compare rig specifications and performance. To me the ARRL did a dis-service by NOT sticking to the strict standards that they set for the "real" rigs (the ones that bring in the big advertizing bucks - alright I'm being a little harsh here - at least ARRL doesn't do the syrupy reviews like CQ magazine).

Finally I think that the ARRL should have stated the criteria for how they were going to test these QRP rigs (they appeared to have used different standards then what is typically used with the big rigs) and they should have stated the differences in the design criteria so a reader could better interpret those numbers. I have built and used just about every one of those rigs reviewed. Some were designed to run low power and have a small size - great for those "To the Field Events". Some were designed for a more "stout" base operation with extra filtering and digital displays. I believe every one of these rig designers had to make some compromises to meet his/her cost, size, battery drain etc. And these compromises MAY effect some of the numbers. To me it's important to know that. Maybe for a beginner the numbers mean nothing - an "easy-to-build" kit may be his/her only criteria. For a more experienced qrper who wants to do contesting etc then "creature-features" may be more important (just tell me that having a simple audio filter before your AF amp stage doesn't help clean up that noisy IF amp and help shape that cw waveform so it sounds so much better than without a filter).

So, to me the ARRL dropped the ball on us QRPers who really appreciate understanding what the numbers mean (or propose to understand - hi).

Other Reviews:

Paul was one of the first ones to venture forth with "his" "free for the asking" evaluation of his rigs using the best test equipment the government has (I wasn't supposed to say that - hi) and he is probably learning that maybe not everyone appreciates his work (I can't believe that can happen here on this benevolent QRP-L list). Maybe someone else tests things differently. Maybe someone else does not like certain tests. Maybe someone loves certain results and hates other results. I bet you not one of us have ever been to a club meeting or up on 80 meters and haven't got yanked into a conversation about who has the better rig - Kenwood, Icom, Yaesu, Ten Tec -

WE KNOW it's a useless conversation because after people spend a megabuck or two they NEED to convince themselves that they made the right choice - what if their spouse finds out they screwed up and didn't get the latest jim-dandy rig out there. Well we need to view our "pride and possession" QRP rigs the same way. Numbers mean nothing - hi. But numbers do help you to understand rigs better and that's why I encourage anyone who has the means (even the simple transmitter efficiency that "Mr Science" Doug Hendricks suggests) to let us know what numbers you come up with and share those with Paul or whoever. Also as we learned in high school science class (when was that) write down your testing procedure - it helps to verify results if you make mods or changes.

So I hope this is a little food for thought. As we new QRPers become more knowledgeable we will become more demanding of our designers (and more \$\$ can be made) to develop better and better qrp rigs (and by the way there are some REALLY GOOD qrp kits out there now). We all gain.

Thanks Paul and thanks to those who sent me thoughtful notes about my first post on Paul's work.

Cheers 73/72 Bob V01DRB/WA6ERB

At 13:15 7/31/96 -0600, you wrote:

>

>The QRP-L group is meant to be a forum to exchange ideas and
>information -

>.....

>72, Paul NA5N

```
-----
| Bob Gobrick - V01DRB/WA6ERB/VE2DRB - Newfoundland, Canada |
| QRP'er Galore - QRP ARCI, GQRP, NORCAL, NEQRP, COQRP, MIQRP, NWQRP |
| Internet:      rgobrick@nfld.com |
| Compuserve:   70466.1405@compuserve.com |
|-----
```

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996

From: "Mike Rhodes" <weightdn@bright.net>

Subject: [1914] Re: Lab Tests

Message-ID: <199608010054.UAA06769@brutus.bright.net>

Since there is no way I could improve on Bob's writings, I will only add my agreement. Keep up the good work Paul.

72/73 de Mike / W8DN

> From: Bob Hirsch <bobh@p3.net>
> To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
> Subject: Re: Lab Tests
> Date: Wednesday, July 31, 1996 4:55 PM

>

>

> > Regarding my lab tests ...

>

> Let others post the results and observations they find and you post
> yours, and let us, as consumers decide for ourselves. That's how the
> system, and this list, work best.

>

> =====

> 73 de Bob, AA3ON

>

> No Code, No HF....Know Code, Know HF!

>

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: brozenske@juno.com (Barrie L Brozenske)
Subject: [1915] Re: Lab Tests
Message-ID: <19960731.211745.4454.2.Brozenske@juno.com>

Paul, I much appreciated your test results, and your explanation of how the data was taken was straight up. I don't think you should buckle to ANY criticism from people with a commercial axe to grind. If you take the action you now contemplate, you are granting them their major objective, that of denying the average ham consumer a source of independent comparative data on the products available in the marketplace.

I do understand why you might feel disgust at their reaction, and a strong reluctance to continue. Upon further reflection, you will undoubtedly recognize the unjustified attacks as a marketer's attempt to INTIMIDATE you. I ask you to PLEASE not cave in. Hams need access to this type of test information. Few of us have access to the rigs, test equipment, or time to make this sort of measurement.

73,
Barrie Brozenske, K3BUZ
brozenske@juno.com

On Wed, 31 Jul 1996 13:15:43 -0600 Paul Harden <pharden@aoc.nrao.edu>
writes:

>

>Wayne and others,

>Regarding my lab tests ...

>

>The QRP-L group is meant to be a forum to exchange ideas and
>information - which frankly, few subscribers do. I am merely sharing
>the information I have access to. If you or anyone else has test
>data on the NorCal 40a, OHR Explorer, etc., then by all means post it.
>I'm sure the owners of these rigs would welcome another point of
>view, as would I.

snip

>The lab tests were intended to COMPLIMENT these rigs, not insult
>them (there is nothing to insult). However, since it has caused
>you such controversy over interpreting the "numbers," I will
>cease posting any further lab tests to QRP-L. I apologize if you
>interpreted the lab tests as a personal attack on you or the
>other designers.

>

>

>

>

>72, Paul NA5N

>

>

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996

From: "Kerry W. Miller" <kmiller@flash.net>

Subject: [1918] Re: Lab Tests

Message-ID: <2.2.32.19960801020054.0069a1b8@pop.flash.net>

Paul,

Keep up the good work. I just built a NorCal 40A (Wilderness variety) and
couldn't be happier with it. I'm having a blast!

Everybody else,

Now the bad news. I read and wiped out the posts of the lab tests. Does
anybody have them on their web page or do I just need to dig through the
digests? It seems a web page would be a good place to post these tests,
maybe with a note here about updates.

All I can say is that I wish I had access to all that cool equipment!

73,
Kerry Miller
WD5ABC

72 just seems awkward to me...

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Joe Gervais <vole@primenet.com>
Subject: [1912] Re: Mac Logging Software
Message-ID: <199608010041.RAA25114@primenet.com>

Jonathan (KC7FYS@aol.com) wrote:

> I want to try using my Mac to log my QSO's. Are there Mac users
> in the NorCal gang that know of good software, or what to avoid
> in this area?

I looked around last year and couldn't find anything that fit
my needs (via shareware, anyway) so I wrote my own. Hey, do I
get any contest multipliers for using HB software? :-)

Anyway, is there interest in a cheaply priced shareware logging
utility out there among fellow Mac users? Or is that niche already
taken? If not, I could clean mine up and get it ready for the
real world. I'm a fulltime software nerd, so the quality of the
app would be above average. Or so I'd hope. :-)

Thoughts?

QRP Tie-in: Well, I log all of my QSO's with the thing, and it's
homebrew. And I designed it for a small, efficient memory
footprint. So it certainly fits the spirit of QRP....

Cheers de KC7NEV,

-Joe, vole@primenet.com, AZ ScQRPion #7

From owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Nick Franco <kf2ph@bnl.gov>
Subject: [1899] Re: need help!
Message-ID: <31B82E85.34E5@bnl.gov>

Scott Hoag wrote:

>
> I have changed my internet carrier from AOL to Frontiernet and can't
> subscribe to the QRP-L. My subscribe post to [listen@lehigh.edu] comes
> back as address unknown. Any help please?Scott,

Should be listserv@lehigh.edu in the to address.

Nick

--

Nicholas J. Franco <>< BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY
Sr. Systems Specialist RHIC Project - Building 1005 - Room 201
Tel: (516) 344-5467 Fax: (516) 344-3674 UPTON, N.Y. 11973-5000
Email: kf2ph@bnl.gov <http://www.rhichome.bnl.gov/People/franco>

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: Monte Stark <ku7y@sage.dri.edu>
Subject: [1904] Re: RSU Parts and Circuit Diagrams
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.90.960731135220.8743A-1000000@vortex.sage.dri.edu>

Hi Gary,

I have used a few of the Radio Shack manuals and have found
them to be of very high quality. Right up there with the
ones from Motorola!

cul,

73, Ron,

.....KU7Y.....ARCI #8829.....Monte "Ron" Stark.....
....ku7y@sage.dri.edu.....Washoe Lake, Nevada....
....QRP-L #17...ARS #49...NorCal #330.....NRA LIFE.....

From owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU Wed Jul 31 23:13:26 1996
From: lhalliday@creo.bc.ca
Subject: [1898] Re: Where is XJ1?
Message-ID: <9606318388.AA838840352@mail.creo.bc.ca>

Industry Canada are receptive to requests for special-event callsigns.
Especially if it celebrates something Canadian - I'm tempted to try
getting one for my birthday. :-)

All Canadian hams are currently authorised to use special callsigns to
commemorate the 100th anniversary of the discovery of gold in Yukon

(not *the* Yukon anymore) - I could be VC7LDH if I wanted to, until 8 August.

When I was first licenced I picked a call at random, but when I checked and found that VE7LDH was free (my initials), the only paperwork I needed was a note to the local IC office. No fee, no hassle. They even handed me a memo pad and a pen to make my written request. We don't think of them as vanity calls in Canada; just something personally significant. All Canadian hams pick their own calls from those currently available in their area.

Since we have a number of different prefixes, we have lots to choose from, but regular ham calls are all VE and (in a couple of areas) VA. The only special prefixes with unfortunate associations are VD (!) and XM, which is both the name of a seriously nice car, and, alas, the old GRS (i.e. CB) prefix before IC's predecessor gave up trying to licence them...

Laura Halliday VE7LDH
lhalliday@creo.bc.ca
ve7ldh@amsat.org
Locator: CN89mg

"C'est une femme mutine, assez
elegante, grave et legere, ayant le
sens du confort et du plaisir
en tout." - C. Deneuve